

REMARKS

Claims 1-28 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1-4, 7-10, 12, 13, 15-17, 21-23 and 25 are amended. No new matter is added.

I. Personal Interview

The courtesies extended to Applicants' representative by Examiner Schubert and Primary Examiner Caldwell during the interview held March 25, 2005, are appreciated. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below and constitute Applicants' record of the interview.

II. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-12 and 15-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,360,254 to Linden et al. (Linden). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Linden fails to disclose each and every feature recited in the rejected claims, as amended. For example, Linden fails to disclose a method of adjusting access rights of a caller, comprising receiving an interaction request from the caller at an interaction manager, retrieving selection criteria relating to the caller, determining access rights of the caller, . . . determining if a token is associated with the caller, and adjusting at least one of the selection criteria based on the token to control access to a caller, as recited in amended claim 1.

Additionally, Linden fails to disclose a system that adjusts access rights of a caller for access to a callee, comprising an input interface that receives an interaction request, and a controller that identifies selection criteria associated with at least one of the caller and an information provider, and identifies a token associated with the caller and adjusts at least one of the selection criteria based on the identified token to control access to the callee, as recited in amended claim 15.

As stated in the Office Action, Linden describes a system whereby a network-attached personal computer requests access to a private resource such as a web page or data record.

Linden further discloses that if the website determines that the user is associated with a valid access token that has not expired, the website sends the user an e-mail with a hypertext link to the private web page or data record. For a private web page for a particular user, a private URL and associated token is assigned (col. 1, lines 58-63). The private URLs are conveyed to the corresponding users by e-mail (preferably within a user-selectable hyperlink) or another communication method and may be used to access the corresponding resource over the Internet (col. 1, lines 64-67).

When a user selects the hyperlink or otherwise requests the private URL, a server application running on the website determines whether the token is valid. If the token is found to be valid, the server application permits the user to access the resource (col. 2, lines 21-25). Each private URL is preferably conveyed to the corresponding user within an e-mail document, either as a simple character string or as part of a hyperlink. The use of e-mail to convey the private URLs reduces the likelihood that unauthorized users will obtain access to the private URLs. When a user attempts to access a resource which has been referenced by a URL of the appropriate format, a token validation program is invoked to validate token and thus the URL (col. 4, lines 6-15).

In Linden, where a hyperlink is used within the e-mail, the user can access the private resource by simply selecting the hyperlink from within an e-mail application that interacts with a browser program. The user can thus access the resource without having to remember or re-enter the private URL. Where a simple character string is used, the user can cut and paste or otherwise re-enter the URL string into the web browser's address field. In either case, the user can save the URL in the browser's list of "favorite places" for future access (col. 4, lines 25-34). Thus, Linden relates to methods for enabling users on a website to efficiently and securely access private web pages (col. 1, lines 11-15).

In contrast, the subject matter recited in the rejected claims relates to adjusting the access rights of a particular person (caller) to obtain access to a callee. The access rights determine the kind and/or amount of information to be provided to a caller (page 3, lines 14-18 of the specification). As recited in the amended claims, the method of adjusting access rights of a caller includes receiving an interaction request from the caller at an interaction manager, retrieving selection criteria relating to the caller, determining access rights of the caller and determining if a token is associated with the caller. If a token is associated with the caller then at least one of the selection criteria is adjusted based on the token to control access to the information, i.e., give the caller certain access rights.

Accordingly, Linden fails to disclose a method of adjusting access rights to information. Rather, Linden merely discloses a method of allowing access to a web page for example, by receiving the URL with an associated token via e-mail or other method which will allow the user to click on the URL or enter it into a browser thereby gaining access to the information on the web page. Therefore, Linden does not disclose adjusting any selection criteria of a caller based on the token to control access to the information, but merely reads the token as a type of password thereby allowing the user access to the web page.

Additionally, Linden fails to disclose an interaction request that includes a request for interaction information that includes at least one of visibility information, accessibility information, and continuity information, as recited in claim 5.

Furthermore, the system in Linden fails to disclose a controller that identifies selection criteria associated with at least one of the caller and an information provider, and identifies a token associated with the caller and adjusts at least one of the selection criteria based on the identified token to control access to the callee. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-12 and 15-26 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) is respectfully requested.

III. Claims Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 13, 14, 27 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,715,802 to Chang. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 13, 14, 27 and 28 are allowable for at least their dependency on their respective base claims for the reasons discussed above, as well as for the additional features recited therein. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 13, 14, 27 and 28 is respectfully requested.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-28 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,


James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

John W. Fitzpatrick
Registration No. 41,018

JAO:JWF/ldg

Date: March 29, 2005

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461
--